

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 31 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 31 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 31 were amended. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-14 and 31 remain at issue.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12, 14, 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rose (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,709). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a content distribution system for performing content transaction management, where a secure container distributing device among the plurality of user devices is configured to compare sampling information input by a user with the template stored in the IDC identified in reference to the IDC identifier list. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the IDC includes a template serving as person identification data of a target user for the content transaction.

Rose is directed to systems and methods for managing the distribution of licensed application programs and application program components. (See col. 1, lines 5-7.) In Rose, the user identifies an application program that the user is interested in trying. (See col. 8, lines 60-62.) If the user has a valid license for the program, the application program is encrypted and stored on the client computer. (See col. 9, lines 35-56.) Thus, the Examiner appears to correspond the license in Rose to the person identification certificate in claim 1.

In Rose, an Application Builder verifies that the client computer has a valid license for the program before decrypting the program. (See col. 9, line 66 through col. 10, line 3 and col. 10, lines 21-25.) The verification includes reading the program file and comparing the licensee

ID in the file with a client ID or a list of client IDs associated with the application builder that is licensed to the client computer. (See col. 9, lines 4-9). Thus, the Examiner appears to correspond the template in claim 1 with either the licensee ID in the file or the client ID/list of client IDs associated with the application builder in Rose. In Rose, however, neither the licensee ID (which is stored in the file) nor the client ID/list of client IDs is included in the license. Thus, Rose does not disclose or suggest an IDC including a template serving as person identification data of a target user for the content transaction, as required by claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1, and claims 2-4, 6-10, 12, and 14 that depend from claim 1 are allowable over Rose. For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 31 is also allowable over Rose. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

**II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, Rose does not disclose or suggest an IDC including a template serving as person identification data of a target user for the content transaction, as required by claim 1. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to sign the container disclosed by Rose to derive claims 11 and 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 4, 2006

By: 

Marima N. Saito

Registration No. 42,121

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

(312) 876-8000